DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 416 SO 013 790

AUTHOR Woolever, Roberta
TITLE Sex Equity in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE 20 Nov 81
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, CUFA (Detroit, MI, November 20, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Accreditation (Institutions); Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Intervention; Methods Courses; Multicultural Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Descriptions; Resource Materials; Sex Differences; *Sex Fairness; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educator Education

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses ways to ensure sex equity in teacher education. Teachers, teacher education, textbooks, and the materials teachers choose to use in the classroom tend to stereotype and discriminate on the basis of sex. Teacher educators have a responsibility to try to intervene. Such intervention is especially appropriate since research has shown that nonsexist teachers and nonsexist teaching materials can have a positive effect on students' attitudes about appropriate roles for themselves and others. The paper describes various intervention programs designed to promote sex equity in preservice teacher education programs. Quality preservice materials that have been developed and field tested are described. The best single source for these materials is the Women's Educational Equity Act Publishing Center. To date, the extent to which sex equity has been included in programs has to a large extent depended on individual teacher trainers. With the new National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards, effective since 1979, this situation is changing and training in sex equity is becoming a nationally acknowledged and enforced standard. The new NCATE standards include multicultural education, which is defined to include the study of sexism, as a criterion. Of the institutions reviewed by NCATE in 1979, not one of the basic programs denied accreditation was cited for weakness in multicultural education. The paper concludes with suggestions for action for teacher educators. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211416

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roberta Woolever

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SEX EQUITY IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Roberta Woolever
Curriculum and Instruction
School of Education
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES
College and University Faculty Assembly (CUFA)
November 20, 1981

SP013790

November 20, 1981

Roberta Woolever
School of Education
University of North
Carolina at Chapel Hill

SEX EQUITY IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The evidence continues to accumulate; teachers and teaching materials stereotype and discriminate on the basis of sex. The classic study on teachers' differential treatment of students, by sex of student, was published fifteen years ago by Sears and Feldman (1966). In 1978, Dweck, Davidson, Nelson, and Enna reported on what they called "sex differences in learned helplessness;" the relative helplessness learned by girls was taught to them by their teachers. The teachers studied were found to be more likely to praise boys only for objectively successful performances while girls were also praised for neatness, following instructions precisely, and for other matters of form rather than substance. By contrast, when giving negative feedback, teachers were more likely to criticize girls for inadequate performance and boys for matters of form (sloppy handwriting, not raising hand, etc.).

The first, and still most frequently referenced, quantitative documentation of sexism in textbooks was published in 1972 under the title of Dick and Jane as Victims (Women on Words and Images); it provided us with an objective content analysis of 134 elementary level basal readers. At the secondary level, Janice Trecker (1971) made an invaluable contribution with the publication of her article on "Women in U. S. history high school textbooks." In a recent survey of sexism in teaching materials, Kathryn Scott (1980) concludes that there is little evidence of change in spite of the documentation of the problem and the issuing of guidelines by publishers for the elimination of sexism in their publications.

It is discouraging enough to find sexism present in teacher behavior and classroom teaching materials ten to fifteen years after the initial exposure of the problem, but Myra and David Sadker (1980) have recently documented yet another

problem. The very textbooks which are used to train teachers in our colleges and universities are sexist. Sadker and Sadker analyzed the twenty-four best-selling teacher education textbooks (published between 1973 and 1978) in seven content areas: foundations, educational psychology, reading, language arts, social studies, science, and math. Their major conclusion was that over 95 percent of the texts gave less than 1 percent of book space to the issue of sex equity. One-third of the texts analyzed did not mention the issue of sexism at all.

On the positive side, over the past few years we have accumulated evidence to show that, while students' perceptions and attitudes are affected by sexist materials (see Scott and Feldman-Summers, 1979) and teacher behaviors, students are also capable of change in a positive direction, given teacher intervention. (Guttentag and Bray, 1976; Woolever 1976, 1977).

All of which leads us to the issue of sex equity in teacher education. If teachers, teacher education textbooks, and the materials teachers choose to use in the classroom tend to stereotype and discriminate on the basis of sex, then clearly we teacher educators have a responsibility to try to intervene. Such intervention is especially appropriate since we now know that non-sexist teachers and non-sexist teaching materials can have a positive effect on students' attitudes about appropriate roles for themselves and others.

We currently have an accumulation of thought and research on the design and implementation of intervention programs designed to promote sex equity in pre-service teacher education programs. Carol Hahn (1980) has developed a useful list of seven goals which can help us to monitor our progress at the professional level, in school organization, and in the elementary and secondary classroom. For example, in the best of all possible worlds: students will be as knowledgeable about female as male contributions to society; there will be no sex difference in knowledge of the various content areas, career goals, or teacher expectations

or management practices; there will be no sex bias in the content of courses taught or instructional materials used.

An interesting intervention model was proposed by Presson and Tubb in a paper presented at the National Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators, February 1979. The paper details the use of a PERT (Program Evaluation and Review Technique) analysis in implementing "multicultural" programs in teacher education. The proposal calls for the infusion and integration of commercially available multicultural materials into a four-year teacher preparation curriculum. The target concepts to be dealt with include: human rights, prejudice, alienation, discrimination, identity conflicts, social justice, stereotypes, and alternative lifestyles.

In defining "multicultural education," the authors focus their concern on "a type of education which is concerned with all cultural groups within a society (p. 4)." They describe culture groups as "those groups which are victims of discrimination because of their unique cultural characteristics (p. 4)."

An examination of the "multicultural" materials to be integrated into their teacher education programs reveals that the authors view sex (or gender identity) group as a culture group. The plan calls for the integration of 31 specific materials (textbooks, films, games, cassettes, modules, etc.) into four existing courses. Of the 31 materials, 10 (32%) address general issues such as discrimination and stereotyping, 5 (16%) address sexism specifically, 13 (42%) are concerned with ethnic and racial groups, and 3 (10%) cover both sex and race/ethnic group discrimination.

Presson and Tubb state that the proposed four-year program is for implementation at a State "Normal" University in Louisiana within the next two years (p. 1)." My search of the literature did not uncover a follow-up report on this proposed program enrichment.

Kimmel, Dickinson, and Topping (1981) of the University of South Florida, implemented an intervention model which focused on sex equity and had as its target audience the students and faculty in an undergraduate elementary education program. The change model included the following steps:

1. Development and use of an outside Advisory Board composed of "influential local educational and political leaders and persons with statewide responsibilities." Activities of the board members included letter writing (to college and university administrators and faculty) in support of the project and a review and critique of the project's proposed curriculum changes.
2. Recruitment and training of key faculty and administrators in the area of sex equity. (The authors concluded that the inclusion of top administrators--the college's dean, associate dean, and director of internship--provided visible and formal support for the project as well as professional expertise). In all, seven teaching faculty and three administrators were identified as "project faculty" and were responsible for identifying and adopting sex equity materials for in-class use.
3. Establishment of formal links to faculty committees (at several decision-making levels) with responsibility for reviewing and changing the elementary education program. During this stage, project faculty kept their own departments and programs advised of their progress and conducted surveys to establish the extent of usage of sex-equity materials by faculty in their courses.
4. Assessment of the model using anecdotal reports by participating project faculty. Also measured were pre- and post-project changes in the knowledge and attitudes of 8 project faculty and administrators and 8 non-project faculty and of 53 undergraduate education students from five classes taught by project faculty members and 41 students in four

classes taught by non-project faculty.

In analyzing their pre- and post-change data, Kimmel, Dickinson, and Topping found that project faculty, as compared to non-project faculty, showed a significant improvement in their knowledge of Title IX but no significant change in attitudes. Turning to the student data, no significant over-all difference was found between the measured attitudes of the experimental and the control groups. Analyzing the data by sex of student, the authors found that the 10 male students in the experimental group experienced change in the opposite direction from the explicit goals of the project;[1] this difference approached significance. There was no statistically significant change by females in the experimental group or by the male or female controls. The test of student knowledge (i.e., mean difference score on the Sex Equity in Education Questionnaire) also revealed no significant difference between the experimental and control groups.

In summary, Kimmel, Dickinson, and Topping characterized their program as a "social influence and public commitment intervention model." The only documented change, in the desired direction, was in faculty knowledge. This seems a minimal effect especially when one considers that the faculty volunteered to participate in the project at an early stage.

For those at the implementation stage, there are many resource materials now available. The single best source is the Women's Educational Equity Act Publishing Center which makes available educational materials and programs whose development was funded by the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEAA) of the U. S. Office of Education.[2] The materials and programs are for use in inservice and

---

[1] It is of interest that three of the five experimental faculty were men.

[2] For a free copy of "Resources for Sex Equity 1980-81 Catalog" send to: Education Development Center, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Mass. 02160.

staff development, content areas in grades K-12, early childhood education, teacher preservice training, counseling and guidance, career development, and educational administration. The materials are characterized by high quality and low price; a winning combination.

As the culmination of a project (NSTEP--Non Sexist Teacher Education Project) funded by the Women's Educational Equity Act, David and Myra Sadker have written a textbook which can be used in a preservice course or for inservice workshops. The text, Sex Equity Handbook for Schools (1981), includes chapters on: research on the cost of sex bias to boys and girls, sexism in education, sex bias in instructional materials, confronting sex bias in classroom interaction, non-sexist teaching, men as victims, and a resource directory. A companion volume, Guide for Sex Equity Trainers (1981, Kaser, Sadker, and Sadker), is available as a practical source of information for the planning and implementation of sex equity training sessions.

Each chapter in the Sex Equity Handbook for Schools is self-contained and designed for easy integration into existing courses. The content was validated by a panel of noted authorities in teacher education, sex equity, and multicultural education and was revised following a field test at ten demonstration sites. The field evaluation team, Bernadine and Bob Stake of the University of Illinois, gathered evaluative responses from 751 college and university students. Sadker and Sadker (1981) summarized the Evaluation Report findings as follows:

> Ten times more students found the materials "relevant" as found them "not relevant;" five times as many students indicated that the equity issues presented in the materials were "timely," as opposed to "out of date;" five times as many students found the materials "well written" as opposed to "poorly written;" and eight times or many students perceived the equity issues presented as "clear," as opposed to "confusing" (p. 334).

It was also found that 77 percent of the students reported, as a result of their readings and class discussions, that they had a better understanding of how teachers can influence the sex stereotyping of students. When asked, "Should sex equity

be taught in this course again?", 74 percent responded "yes."

For those institutions/instructors considering the addition of a course on sex equity, rather than an infusion of related materials into existing courses, Sex Equity in Education (Stockard, et al; 1980) should prove valuable. This text (also funded by WEEA) deals with the nature of sex inequities, the psychology of sex differences, sexism in educational professions, context for change, the law, the women's movement, and current and future needs. Each of the nine chapters includes an extensive bibliography.

Thus far we have established that the need for teacher awareness and training in the area of sex equity still exists, that rationals and guidelines for teacher education programs have been developed and in some cases implemented, and that quality preservice materials have been developed and field tested. But by what mechanism should sex equity become a part of the initial training program of each and every teacher? To date, the extent to which sex equity has been included in programs has depended on individual teacher trainers; it has rarely been the case that education in sex equity has been mandated by an institution of higher learning, by a state department, by a school or college of education, or by a specific degree program. Clearly, we can only feel our job is done which training in sex equity is a nationally acknowledged and enforced standard.

The accreditation of programs of teacher education would appear to offer a mechanism for holding institutions accountable for training teachers who are knowledgeable about and committed to sex equity. The single most pervasive accrediting agency in the United States is the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Formed in 1954 by associations representing state departments of education, the teaching profession, and local boards of education, NCATE currently has accredited professional programs at approximately 550 institutions of higher learning. It is estimated that over 80 percent of American teachers and school support personnel now graduate from NCATE-accredited programs. NCATE clearly has

the power to make a difference.

The primary goals of NCATE are: (1) to improve teacher education through the formulation of professional standards and the application of the standards to programs of teacher education and (2) to stimulate institutional self-evaluation. Effective January 1, 1979, the NCATE Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education displayed a clear commitment to the idea that the curricula of teacher education programs should include instruction in "multicultural education." The NCATE Standards define "multicultural" as follows (Standard 2.1.1--Multicultural Education):

> Multicultural education could include but not be limited to experiences which: (1) Promote analytical and evaluative abilities to confront issues such as participatory democracy, racism and sexism, and the parity of power; (2) Develop skills for values clarification including the study of the manifest and latent transmission of values; (3) Examine the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing teaching strategies; and (4) Examine linguistic variations and diverse learning styles as a basis for the development of appropriate teaching strategies. (p. 4, emphasis added)

Additionally, institutions reviewed by NCATE are assessed as to their commitment to multicultural education as reflected in their policies for recruiting teacher education faculty (Standard 3.1--Competence and Utilization of Faculty) and on the extent to which they provide opportunities for faculty to develop and implement innovations in multicultural education and for developing new areas of expertise (Standard 3.4--Conditions for Faculty Development). Standard 6.3 (Long-Range Planning) requires that "the long-range plan of the institution reflect a commitment to multicultural education (p. 11)."

Three key points emerge: (1) the vast majority of educators are currently prepared at institutions which have received NCATE accreditation, (2) the NCATE Standards make repeated reference to the need to include "multicultural education," and (3) NCATE defines "multicultural education" to include the study of sexism. Can we then conclude that most teachers have been trained in the broadly defined area of "multicultural education" which includes sex equity? Unfortunately, we

cannot. The new (1979) NCATE standards, which for the first time included multicultural education as a criterion, became effective less than three years ago. NCATE accreditation is good for five years and can be extended for an additional five years given a satisfactory, but cursory, review in year five of the first five years. Thus, many institutions have yet to be held accountable by the new standards. But what about the institutions which have been reviewed since 1978? With the implementation of the new standards in 1979, NCATE began publication of an Annual Report which includes an analysis of Council decisions on programs evaluated during the calendar year. Because the analysis is done with respect to each specific Standard for accreditation, it is possible to determine the number of teacher education programs which were found to be deficient in the broadly defined area of "multicultural education."

A total of 67 institutions were reviewed in 1979. Of these, 69% had all of their preparation programs approved, 9% had all programs denied approval, and 22% had some programs denied. In order for a program to be denied approval, "weakness" had to be documented in at least two broad categories (families) of standards; the average denied program was cited for weakness in over seven individual standards from among four different families. Of importance for our study is the fact that not one of the basic (initial preparation) programs denied accreditation in 1979 was cited for "weakness" in "multicultural education" (Standard 2.1.1). Only three denied advanced (post-baccalaureate) programs, all at one institution, were found "weak" in the area of "multicultural education."

A look at the eight most common basic program weaknesses, for all programs reviewed in 1979, whether ultimately denied accreditation or not, reveals the same pattern; "multicultural education" does not appear on the list of most common weaknesses cited.

Also of interest is the fact that "multicultural education" does not appear on the enumeration of the seven most common basic program strengths in 1979. The

1979 Annual Report does, however, single out and name five schools (out of a total of 59 schools whose basic programs were reviewed) which were cited for "strength" on the new multicultural standard; four (out of 48) institutions with advanced programs were cited, by name, for strength on this standard.

For those of us who believe that "weakness" in the area of "multicultural education" is much more pervasive than the 1979 NCATE Annual review of accreditation actions would indicate, the Annual Report for 1980 is somewhat more heartening. Of the 64 institutions whose programs were reviewed, 13 (20%) had one or more programs denied accreditation. Of those who had at least one basic program denied, 2 were cited for weakness in "multicultural education" (for a total of 4 programs cited). "Multicultural educations" thus ranked seventh on a list of "basic standards ranked by frequency of weakness cited in accreditation denials at two or more institutions." "Multicultural education" was cited as a weakness in 7 advanced programs (at 5 institutions) and ranked eighth in frequency of weaknesses cited.

As summarized in the NCATE 1980 Annual Report:

> Where failure to meet multicultural education standards 2.1.1 and G-2.1.1 was not a factor in the denial of any basic and only one advanced program in 1979, violations of multicultural education standards were cited in 36% of the 1980 denials of basic programs and 25% of denials for advanced programs. We reported in 1979 that the Council apparently was taking a "wait and see" attitude with regard to multicultural education. Apparently the Council has concluded that it has waited and seen enough. (p. 7)

Additional encouragement is provided by the following data. A look at weaknesses cited, for all basic programs, including those approved and denied accreditation, reveals that "multicultural education" ranked fourth (9 institutions cited) among the most frequently cited weaknesses. At the advanced program level, by contrast, "multicultural education" was not among the seven most common program weaknesses.

On the positive side, "multicultural education" was ranked second on a list of seven most common basic program strengths in 1980, with 15 out of 54 institutions

(28%) cited. At the advanced program level, "multicultural education" was ranked third as most common program strength, with 8 out of 47 institutions (17%) singled out. Again, the institutions with strength in basic and/or advanced programs were listed by name because "so many requests are made to the NCATE office for information on the location of strong programs in multicultural education (p. 10)."

The inclusion of "sexism" in the NCATE definition of what constitutes "multicultural education" is significant on two counts. First, the NCATE statement only says that sexism could be included; we therefore have no assurance that even programs with post-1978 NCATE accreditation include training in sex equity. Second, it is unusual for educators and professional organizations to include sex equity in defining "multicultural education."

While I believe that the case can easily be made that sex (or gender identity) group constitutes a "culture group" (i.e., each sex has been taught to behave to meet a different set of established expectations and perceptions; when members of one sex get together they display stereotyped patterns of behavior, voice tonality, body language, and verbal language; sex-specific behavior is passed from generation to generation; etc.), we with a primary interest in sex equity are in danger of being left out as national, state, and institutional standards for teacher education are being established. The NCATE standard is certainly a case in point. Another case for concern is the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) with approximately 800 member institutions.

In 1974, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education published a book titled: Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education. This report, of an AACTE sponsored project, contains a prologue and epilogue written by the editor, William Hunter, and 14 chapters, each attributed to a different author (or set of authors). The only discussion of "multicultural education" which included sex as a component of "culture" was provided by Hunter in the prologue:

> Modern American society is a unique mosaic of cultures, linked and interrelated through a pervading way of life contributed to and shared by all Americans, yet recognizing and accommodating its contributory cultures. These cultural variants may be in many forms, such as language, customs, traditions, beliefs, religions, art, technology, national origin, political persuasion, racial identity, ethnic heritage, sex, age group, socioeconomic level, geographical location, and other characteristics or attributes which define and constitute group aggregates. It is therefore apparent, if education in the United States is to meet the needs of its peoples, that it must have a life blood of multicultural content in order to be sociologically relevant, philosophically germane, psychologically material, and pedagogically apropos. [p. 11; emphasis added]

The prologue also contains the official (1970) and definitive statement of the AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education; the statement endorses the value of cultural pluralism. Education for cultural pluralism is described as including four main thrusts (p. 22):

1) the teaching of values which support cultural diversity and individual uniqueness;
2) the encouragement of the qualitative expansion of existing ethnic cultures and their incorporation into the mainstream of American socioeconomic and political life;
3) the support of explorations in alternative and emerging life styles; and
4) the encouragement of multiculturalism, multilingualism, and multidialectism.

The whole of the official statement makes no specific mention of sex, sexism, of sex equity; neither do any of the authors of the 14 chapters and epilogue which follow.

By contrast, a 1977 AACTE sponsored "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education," included several items related to sex equity. The survey was sent to the 786 AACTE member institutions and was completed and returned by 387 (49.2 percent). Of those responding, 52 percent indicated that they had provision in their program for the "study of sexism." The study of sexism, as a program activity in multicultural educations, was rated as "highly desirable" by 71 percent of the institutions but was ranked thirteenth in "educational desirability" out

of the fifteen multicultural program activities listed for ranking.

Of those who reported, 15 percent (67) indicated that their institutions had departments of women's studies and 60.5 percent (270) said that their institutions offered courses in women's studies. Of the half of the AACTE membership which provided survey data, only 8.7 percent (37) indicated that they required students to take any women's studies courses.[3]

The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) issued and nationally distributed a Position Statement in 1976 entitled "Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education." The guidelines are clearly limited to ethnic pluralism; by no one's definition is sex or gender identity group considered "ethnic."

While the main thrust of NCSS has been in working to add multiethnic education to the school curriculum, sex equity has not been ignored. NCSS, in 1971, established a sexism advisory board, now called the Sexism and Social Justice Committee, and has since published several Bulletins on the topic: Teaching About Women in the Social Studies (Grahms, 1976) and Racism and Sexism: Responding to the Challenge (Simms and Contreras, 1980).[4] Additionally, a special section on sexism was included in Social Education in March of 1975 and another is scheduled for January of 1982.

At the policy level, the NCSS Board of Directors has on record a 9-point Position Statement on sex equity. Some of the policy is directed toward the elimination of sex discrimination within NCSS itself, but several points pertain to curriculum and materials development and to teacher training. Point 4 calls for encouraging the development of curriculum materials on women in history, sex

---

[3]Survey results obtained, by phone, from Donna Gollnick of AACTE, Washington, D. C.

[4]Two additional NCSS publications contain single chapters on sex equity issues: the 1973 Yearbook, Teaching Ethnic Studies (Banks, Ed.) and Bulletin #63, Improving the Use of Social Studies Textbooks (1980; Patton, Ed.).

roles, social justice for women, and related values analysis. Other points address the need to: focus the attention of the schools on the "hidden curriculum," sponsor workshops devoted to social justice for women, encourage the publication of related materials, and encourage the development of sexism awareness at the preservice and inservice levels.

On balance, NCSS appears to have been relatively sensitive to the issue of sex equity. Publications and policy have specifically addressed the issue of sexism while sex equity has also been included under the larger umbrella concept of "pluralism."

Suggestions for Action for Teacher Educators

1. Strive to ensure that each professional organization develops and widely distributes an official statement on sex equity and then works to make sex equity in American education a reality. If an organization currently has a position statement on "multicultural education," "cultural pluralism," "educational equity," (etc.) which does specifically and unequivocally include sex equity, then that statement should be expanded or a new statement dealing exclusively with sex equity should be developed.

2. Work within your own college or department of education to make sex equity an issue. Sex equity related material should be integrated into every appropriate preservice course. If women's studies courses are offered on your campus, your students should be required to take them. All student teachers should be held accountable for developing non-sexist curriculum, for developing and/or using non-sexist teaching materials, and for demonstrating classroom teaching behaviors which do not discriminate on the basis of sex.

3. Do not use sex-biased textbooks in your teacher education courses. If you

can't find a relevant and non-biased text,[5] use a biased book but help your students to see why you find the book to be flawed; supplement the text with information on sexism, the role of women in education, the psychology of sex difference, etc.; and let the publisher know of your specific criticisms and intention to adopt a quality, non-biased text as soon as one is published.

4. Continue to work to remove sex bias from classroom teaching materials. The research is clear; teachers rely heavily on commercial materials--textbooks, films, workbooks, etc.--to determine the content of their lessons, units, and courses of study.

5. Participate in implementing, planning, and delivering teacher inservice workshops which address the issue of sex equity. With a declining student enrollment and a reduction in teacher turn-over, it is critical that the teachers already in the field be helped to become aware of sex equity as a part of the larger goal of providing educational equity for all students.

6. Contribute to the growing body of literature on sex equity in education. Of particular value would be studies to document the effect of model programs (and materials) for preservice and inservice teacher education.

---

[5] A new, and non-biased, text is now available for introductory courses: Teachers Make the Difference, by Myra and David Sadker, New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

REFERENCES

Dweck, C., Davidson, W., Nelson, S., and Enna, B. "Sex differences in learned helplessness: II. The contengencies of evaluative feedback in the classroom and III. An experimental analysis," Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 268-276.

Grahms, J. D. (Ed.). Teaching about women in the social studies: Concepts, methods, and materials, Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, Bulletin #48, 1976.

Guttentag, M. and Bray, H. Undoing sex stereotypes: Research and resources for educators, New York: McGraw Hill, 1976.

Hahn, C. "Social studies with equality and justice for all: Toward the elimination of sexism," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1980, 13, 103-112.

Hunter, W. (Ed.). Multicultural education through competency-based teacher education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Kaser, J., Sadker, M., and Sadker, D. Guide for sex equity trainers, New York: Longman, 1981.

Kimmel, E., Dickinson, J., and Topping, M. "Curriculum revision for sex-fair elementary education: Analysis of an intervention model," Peabody Journal of Education, 1981 (April), 154-160.

Martin, W. and Terry, A. (Eds.). "Sex equity guidelines for teacher educators." Interinstitutional Consortium for Career Education, Salem, Oregon, August, 1979. (ERIC document number: ED 177 332)

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education, NCATE, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 411, Washington, D. C. 20006, 1979.

National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), "Curriculum guidelines for multiethnic education," Position Statement, Social Education, 1976 (October).

Presson, J. and Tubb, G. "PERT analysis used in implementing multicultural programs in teacher education." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Association of Teacher Educators, 1979. (ERIC document number : ED 175 802)

Sadker, M. and Sadker, D. Beyond pictures and pronouns: Sexism in teacher education textbooks, EDC/WEEA Publishing Center, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Mass. 02160, 1980, 70 pp.

Sadker, M. and Sadker, D. "The development and field trial of a non-sexist teacher education curriculum," High School Journal, 1981 (May), 331-336.

Sadker, D. and Sadker, M. Sex equity handbook for schools, New York: Longman, 1981.

Scott, K., "Sexist and nonsexist materials: What impact do they have?", Elementary School Journal, 1980, 81, 47-52.

Scott, K. and Feldman-Summers, S., "Children's reactions to textbook stories in which females are portrayed in traditional male roles, Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 396-402.

Sears, P. and Feldman, D. "Teacher interactions with boys and with girls", National Elementary Principal, 1966, 46, 30-35.

Simms, R. and Contreras, G. (Eds.). Racism and Sexism: Responding to the Challenge. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, Bulletin #61, 1980.

Trecker, J. "Women in U. S. history high school textbooks," Social Education, 1971, 35, 249-260; 338.

Stockard, J., Schmuck, P., Kempner, K., Williams, P., Edson, S., and Smith, M. A. Sex equity in education, New York: Academic Press, 1980.

Women on Words and Images. Dick and Jane as victims: Sex stereotyping in children's readers, Princeton, N. J.: Women on Words and Images, 1972.

Woolever, R. Expanding elementary pupil's occupational and social role perceptions: An examination of teacher attitudes and pupil attitude change. Unpublished dissertation, University of Washington (Seattle), 1976.

Woolever, R. "Expanding elementary pupils' occupational and social role perceptions: An innovative federal project," University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 12 pp. (ERIC document number--ED 133 249)